

## APPENDICES

**Appendix A. Organizational Design & Executive Team Biographies**

**Appendix B. County Administrative Transition Schedule**

**Appendix C. Collectibility Study—Performance Measures Summary Charts**

**Appendix D. Collectibility Study—Preliminary Arrearages Findings**

**Appendix E. Performance Measures Adopted by DCSS**

**Appendix F. Remaining County Interim Systems Conversion Schedule**

**Appendix G. CCSAS Qualified Business Partner Pool**



## Appendix A – Organization Description & Executive Team Biographies

### Organization Description

The following provides a brief description of the organizational entities established effective September 1, 2000.

#### Director and Chief Deputy Director

The Directorate consists of the Director and Chief Deputy Director. The Director is responsible for the development, implementation, and maintenance of the statewide child support program and ensuring the Department's mission to serve California's children is met. The Chief Deputy Director is primarily responsible for the day-to-day internal operations of DCSS and ensuring that the required responsibilities are successfully performed.

#### Office of Research & Program Design

The mission of the *Office of Research and Program Design* is to develop, evaluate, and support innovative projects and practices that enhance child support operations throughout the State. The office performs research activities that evaluate best practices, seeks grants and other funding opportunities to test program improvements, and assesses performance of the child support program through collection and analysis of data. The office provides quality assurance for reports and documents published by the department to ensure consistency and data accuracy in reporting. The office also manages all child support demonstration projects, evaluates project results, and makes recommendations for child support program implementation. This includes collaboration projects with other organizations interested in exploring potential program improvements. This is a new statewide function that has been staffed with professional researchers and analysts.

#### Office of Legal Services

The *Office of Legal Services* is responsible for providing litigation support and administrative appeals, other legal services and conducting special investigations for the Department, including providing legal representation in personnel matters and consultation to DCSS staff on the development of policies, practices, and regulations. The office is also responsible for coordinating and monitoring child support litigation throughout the State.

#### Office of Strategic Planning

The *Office of Strategic Planning* is responsible for facilitating strategic business and information technology planning activities throughout DCSS. This includes establishing and maintaining structured processes for monitoring and evaluating progress toward reaching the program's strategic goals. In addition, the office is responsible for assisting Divisions/Sections in developing their operational business plans.

## Appendix A – Organization Description & Executive Team Biographies

### *Office of Legislative Services*

The *Office of Legislative Services* is responsible for planning, coordinating and implementing the department's legislative program. This includes recommending positions on proposed legislation and representing the Department's position on state and federal legislation, promoting the department's legislative proposals, and serving as a liaison between the Department and the Legislature.

### *Office of Public Affairs*

The *Office of Public Affairs* is responsible for all interaction with the media on the Department's behalf. The Chief serves as Public Information Officer (PIO) and is responsible for tracking news articles and other publications on child support issues, coordination and review of outreach and education activities, reviewing documents for publication, and developing innovative methods and materials for generating child support awareness.

### *Child Support Services Division*

The *Child Support Services Division* is the heart of the Department and is responsible for child support program policy, operations, support and services. The division consists of three inter-related branches structured to support the delivery of services in a consistent, efficient and effective manner in every county throughout the State. The division also provides program policy-level direction to the statewide automation system development activities. This division provides functional responsibility, leadership and guidance for the development and implementation of the new regional offices established to help administer the restructured statewide child support program.

The Child Support Services Division is comprised of three branches and two individual sections. The Statewide Consulting Section is responsible for providing policy and operational support and analysis to the CCSAS Project. The Regional Support Unit will provide assistance and support to the Regional Administrators in the Southern Region. The three branches include:

- Policy Branch
- Customer & Community Services Branch
- County Support Branch.

### Regional Administrators

Six Regional Administrator positions have been established. The role of the Regional Administrator is to provide onsite support to the local child support agencies, County Administrators, and Boards of Supervisors through policy level technical assistance, performance assessment and uniform service delivery consistent with the statewide standards established by the DCSS.

## Appendix A – Organization Description & Executive Team Biographies

### Regional Map



Figure 1 Regional Administrator Assignments

## Appendix A – Organization Description & Executive Team Biographies

### Northern California Regions

The Northern California Regions includes the following counties:

<u>REGION 1</u>	<u>REGION 2</u>	<u>REGION 3</u>	<u>REGION 4</u>
Butte	Alameda	Alpine	Fresno
Colusa	Contra Costa	Amador	Kings
Del Norte	Marin	Calaveras	Merced
Glenn	Napa	El Dorado	Monterey
Humboldt	San Francisco	Inyo	Sacramento
Lake	San Mateo	Madera	San Benito
Lassen	Santa Clara	Mariposa	San Joaquin
Mendocino	Santa Cruz	Mono	Stanislaus
Modoc	Solano	Nevada	Tulare
Plumas	Sonoma	Placer	Merced
Shasta		Sierra	Monterey
Siskiyou		Tuolumne	
Sutter			
Tehama			
Trinity			
Yolo			
Yuba			

### Southern California Regions

The Southern California Regions includes the following counties:

<u>REGION 5</u>	<u>REGION 6</u>
Imperial	Los Angeles
Kern	Orange
Riverside	San Diego
San Bernardino	
San Luis Obispo	
Santa Barbara	
Ventura	

Northern area administrators have been selected and will be stationed initially at the DCSS Sacramento office. Recruitment and selection for Southern Regional Administrators is scheduled to be completed by Spring 2001. Southern Regional Administrators will be stationed in southern California with a small complement of support staff.

## Appendix A – Organization Description & Executive Team Biographies

### *Administrative Services Division*

The *Administrative Services Division* is responsible for providing financial, personnel, and business services for DCSS. These responsibilities include, but are not limited to, financial management, budgeting and accounting, personnel examinations, labor relations, contracts, and business services functions. The Administrative Services Division is comprised of the following two branches:

- Financial Services Branch
- Administrative Resources Branch.

### *Technology Services Division*

The *Technology Services Division* is responsible for providing information technology services and products in support of DCSS programs and automation projects. The Technology Services Division provides the technical infrastructure that supports the Department's local and wide area network services, personal computer installation and maintenance, and HELP Desk services. The Division is responsible for the conversion, maintenance and management of the six federally approved consortia systems that support the child support program until the statewide system is implemented. The Technology Services Division is comprised of the following three branches and two sections:

- Pre-Statewide Interim Systems Management (PRISM) Branch
- Systems Support Branch
- Automation Approvals/Departmental Automation Branch
- Application Support Section
- IT Infrastructure Section.

### *Executive Team Members*

The executive team consists of people who have been selected based on their individual knowledge, skills, abilities, prior experience and strong leadership strengths. The executive team members together bring the necessary leadership to ensure the restructured child support program and statewide automated system are implemented successfully.

### *Director*

On February 10, 2000 the Governor appointed the first Director of DCSS, Curtis L. Child. Previously, Mr. Child served as the Principal Consultant to the Assembly Human Services Committee, a position he held since 1997. In that position he assisted in crafting California's welfare and child support reform legislation. Prior to his appointment, Mr. Child was an attorney with various legal aid organizations where he litigated and advocated on child support, public benefits and health care issues. He also served as project director for the Child Support Assurance Project and on the Board of Trustees for the Association for Children for the Enforcement

## Appendix A – Organization Description & Executive Team Biographies

of Support (ACES). He is a member of the California and Utah State Bar Associations.

### *Chief Deputy Director*

The Governor appointed Chief Deputy Director Carole A. Hood in May 2000. Ms. Hood brings to the position many years of experience and expertise in children and family issues. As Chief Executive Officer of the California Alliance of Child and Family Services, Ms. Hood headed one of the largest non-profit organizations for children and family services in California. Prior to that position, Ms. Hood had 22 years of experience in State government, including serving as Chief Deputy Director of the Departments of Mental Health, Social Services (DSS) and Developmental Services. Ms. Hood also served as Deputy Secretary of the California Health and Human Services Agency (formerly Health and Welfare Agency) and Interim Director for the Department of Alcohol and Drug Program.

### *Deputy Director, Child Support Services Division*

The Governor appointed Edwina Young as Deputy Director, Child Support Services Division in May 2000. Ms. Young has 35 years of experience working in child support services. Before joining DCSS, Ms. Young served as the Director of the City and County of San Francisco District Attorney Family Support Bureau and Director of the Local Child Support Program since 1986. Ms. Young also served as regional representative for the Federal Office of Child Support Enforcement and administrator for the Los Angeles County Bureau of Child Support Operations. Ms. Young is known and respected throughout the nationwide child support community for her commitment to the child support program and children.

### *Deputy Director, Administrative Services Division*

The Director appointed George Peacher as Deputy Director, Administrative Services Division in April 2000. Mr. Peacher brings over 25 years of experience in state government to this position. Mr. Peacher has a strong background in the application of fiscal policy as it relates to county government, including the development and application of government cost allocation principles. His most recent assignment before joining DCSS was Chief of the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) Fiscal Systems and Accounting Branch. As part of that assignment, he was instrumental in laying the groundwork for the new funding structure for the local child support agencies.

### *Assistant Director, Office of Research & Program Design*

Leora Gershenzon, appointed by the Governor on July 2000, comes to DCSS with a long history of experience as a child support advocate. She previously served as the directing attorney of the child support project for the National Center for Youth Law where she managed projects to improve child support enforcement in California. Ms. Gershenzon was an early supporter of the child support reform legislation that created DCSS and has worked closely with the child support program for the last eight years. Ms. Gershenzon is a member of the California

## **Appendix A – Organization Description & Executive Team Biographies**

Bar Association and brings to her position expertise on the laws, policies, and regulations that govern the California child support program.

### *Assistant Director, Office of Strategic Planning*

Joan Obert, Assistant Director, Office of Strategic Planning, has 22 years of experience with California state government. Ms. Obert began her career at the Legislative Counsel Bureau/Legislative Data Center before transferring to the FTB. Prior to assuming her DCSS position, Ms. Obert led the FTB Office of Corporate Planning where she developed structured strategic business, IT and operational planning processes for the department that included performance outcomes and measures. Ms. Obert has led numerous customer service, process analysis, and workflow redesign workshops. She has many years of experience in leading teams and facilitating communication and collaboration between individuals with diverse backgrounds and interests.

## Appendix B – County Administrative Transition Schedule

County	Anticipated Transition Date	Must be Completed No Later Than	Caseload	
			Per County	Per Phase
Phase 1 – Pioneer				
Alpine	12/15/00	Completed	169	275,270
Colusa	12/01/00	Completed	1,059	
Contra Costa	12/31/00	Completed	58,570	
Nevada	12/31/00	Completed	5,407	
Placer	12/16/00	Completed	12,162	
Riverside	12/01/00	Completed	128,484	
San Francisco	10/19/00	Completed	29,724	
Santa Barbara	12/22/00	Completed	18,387	
Santa Cruz	12/23/00	Completed	10,177	
Sierra <sup>1</sup>	12/31/00	Completed	205	
Yuba	12/15/00	Completed	10,926	
Phase 2				
Butte	06/30/01	12/31/2001	19,890	1,036,352
El Dorado	06/30/01	12/31/2001	9,234	
Inyo	06/30/01	12/31/2001	1,856	
Kern	12/31/01	12/31/2001	55,562	
Los Angeles	06/30/01	12/31/2001	532,617	
Mariposa	06/30/01	12/31/2001	1,013	
Mendocino	06/30/01	12/31/2001	6,173	
Mono	06/30/01	12/31/2001	574	
Monterey	06/30/01	12/31/2001	22,560	
Plumas	06/30/01	12/31/2001	1,644	
San Benito	06/30/01	12/31/2001	3,950	
San Bernardino	06/30/01	12/31/2001	172,710	
San Diego	06/30/01	12/31/2001	158,815	
Trinity	06/30/01	12/31/2001	1,324	
Tulare	06/30/01	12/31/2001	44,205	
Tuolumne	06/30/01	12/31/2001	4,225	

<sup>1</sup> Consolidated with Nevada County.

## Appendix B – County Administrative Transition Schedule

County	Anticipated Transition Date	Must be Completed No Later Than	Caseload	
			Per County	Per Phase
Phase 3				
Alameda	06/30/02	12/31/2002	58,467	
Amador	06/30/02	12/31/2002	1,947	
Calaveras	06/30/02	12/31/2002	2,589	
Del Norte	06/30/02	12/31/2002	4,593	
Fresno	06/30/02	12/31/2002	71,390	
Glenn	06/30/02	12/31/2002	2,112	
Humboldt	06/30/02	12/31/2002	8,898	
Imperial	06/30/02	12/31/2002	10,932	
Kings	06/30/02	12/31/2002	10,136	
Lake	06/30/02	12/31/2002	7,031	
Lassen	06/30/02	12/31/2002	1,890	
Madera	06/30/02	12/31/2002	7,552	
Marin	06/30/02	12/31/2002	4,184	
Merced	06/30/02	12/31/2002	16,923	
Modoc	06/30/02	12/31/2002	1,144	
Napa	06/30/02	12/31/2002	5,452	
Orange	06/30/02	12/31/2002	106,099	
Sacramento	06/30/02	12/31/2002	78,182	
San Joaquin	06/30/02	12/31/2002	42,259	
San Luis Obispo	06/30/02	12/31/2002	7,906	
San Mateo	06/30/02	12/31/2002	18,106	
Santa Clara	06/30/02	12/31/2002	67,702	
Shasta	06/30/02	12/31/2002	16,946	
Siskiyou	06/30/02	12/31/2002	4,969	
Solano	06/30/02	12/31/2002	26,670	
Sonoma	06/30/02	12/31/2002	21,257	
Stanislaus	06/30/02	12/31/2002	37,533	
Sutter	06/30/02	12/31/2002	8,063	
Tehama	06/30/02	12/31/2002	5,272	
Ventura	06/30/02	12/31/2002	32,238	
Yolo	06/30/02	12/31/2002	13,443	
Total Caseload				701,885
				2,013,507

## Appendix C – Collectibility Study Performance Measures Summary Findings

Table 1. County Economic, Demographic, and Social Characteristics

### Economic Characteristics

Unemployment Rate 1999  
Percent of Population that is Employed 1999  
Per Capita Income 1997  
Average Earnings 1998  
Median Income 1997  
County Government Tax Collected per Capita 1996-1997  
County Government Tax Collected per \$1000 Income 1996-97  
Total Adjusted Gross Income 1997  
Fair Market Rent 1998  
Percent of Labor Force Employed In Agriculture 1999

### Demographic Characteristics

Total Population 1999  
Number of Children 1999

### Social Problems Characteristics

Per Capita Incarceration 1998  
Child Poverty Rate 1995  
Infant Mortality Rate per 1,000 Births 1997  
Percent of Children Receiving TANF 1998  
Teen Birth Rate per 1000 Births 1997  
High School Drop Out Rate 1997-98

### Other

Military Strength per Capita  
Miles from the Mexican-US Border

## Appendix C – Collectibility Study Performance Measures Summary Findings

Table 2. Correlation Coefficients between Child Support Performance Measures

	Collection Rate	Support Orders	Paying toward Arrears	Paternity Establishment	Cost Effectiveness	Percent Collected	Average Collected	Percent Summons	Support Establish1999
<i>Federal Performance Measures</i>									
Collections Rate	1.00		-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Support Orders	.19	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paying Arrears	.03	.12	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	-
Paternity Establishment	.19	-.09	-.33	1.00	-	-	-	-	-
Cost-Effectiveness	-.01	.18	-.05	.15	1.00	-	-	-	-
<i>State Performance Measures</i>									
Percent Cases Collected	<u>.42</u>	.76	.34	-.08	.17	1.00	-	-	-
Average Collection	.30	.16	-.15	-.16	.02	.11	1.00	-	-
Percent Summons	.01	<u>.60</u>	.21	-.11	.12	<u>.53</u>	-.10	1.00	-
Support Establish (1999)	-.05	<u>.45</u>	.16	-.08	.20	.31	-.05	.80	1.00
Arrears Orders	.21	.76	-.08	-.12	.02	.80	.14	<u>.43</u>	.03

### Appendix C – Collectibility Study Performance Measures Summary Findings

Table 3. Correlation Coefficients Between Child Support Performance Measures and County Characteristics

Performance Measures (FFY 1999)	County Characteristics				
	County Population 1/1/99	Unemployment Rate 1999	Per Capita Income 1997	Percent of Children in Poverty	Teen Birth Rate 1997
<b>Federal Performance Measures</b>					
Collections Rate	<u>-.32</u>	-.05	.19	<u>-.38</u>	<u>-.32</u>
Percent of Cases w/ Support	-.23	.03	.05	-.15	-.27
Percent of Arrears Cases	.20	.05	.05	-.04	.12
Paternity Establishment	-.11	.22	-.22	.21	.09
Cost Effectiveness	.02	.14	-.23	.11	.21
<b>Additional State Performance Measures</b>					
Percent of Cases with Collection	-.22	-.02	.06	<u>-.32</u>	<u>-.30</u>
Average Collection	-.09	<u>-.33</u>	.54	-.50	<u>-.32</u>
Rate Served Summons	-.14	.18	-.19	-.01	-.02
Rate of Support Orders Est. in	.05	.25	-.13	.12	.12
Percent of Cases w/ Arrears Orders	-.48	-.02	.00	<u>-.30</u>	<u>-.38</u>

## Appendix D – Collectibility Study Preliminary Arrearages Findings

Table 1. Characteristics of California's Child Support Debtors (March 2000)

Number of Individuals	834,908
Total Debt	\$14.4 Billion
Average Debt	\$17,288
Median Debt	\$9,621

Source: DCSS Integrated Data Base

Table 2. Percent of Debtors and Debt Held, by Debt Amount

Debt Bracket	Percent of Debtors	Percent of Debt
\$0-\$1,000	12%	0%
\$1,001-\$5,000	22%	4%
\$5,001-\$10,000	17%	7%
\$10,001-\$20,000	20%	17%
\$20,001-\$40,000	17%	27%
\$40,001-\$100,000	10%	34%
\$100,001+	1%	11%

Source: DCSS Integrated Data Base

## Appendix D – Collectibility Study Preliminary Arrearages Findings

Table 3. Number of Debtors and Amount of Debt Held by Debtors by Data Sources

	Number of Debtors/(%)	Amount of Debt/(%)
<b>Available EDD Data</b>		
EDD Data (any year)	511,769 (61.3%)	\$7,815,921,199 (54.2%)
<b>Of Those Without EDD Data, Other Sources of Income Data</b>		
State Tax Return Data (any year)	29,661 (3.6%)	\$485,831,682 (3.4%)
Other FTB Data but no Tax Data (Wage Master File)	34,297 (4.1%)	\$633,021,487 (4.4%)
<b>Of Those with No EDD Data or other Income Data, Other Sources of Data</b>		
FIDM Data	17,336 (2.1%)	\$399,079,233 (2.8%)
Death Recorded and No FIDM Data	66 (0.0%)	\$2,167,624 (0.0%)
In Prison or CYA, and no Death Recorded	8,668 (1.0%)	\$205,584,568 (1.4%)
Those in at Least One Administrative Data Set	601,818 (72.1%)	\$9,787,524,706 (66.1%)
<b>No Available Data, By Residence</b>		
CA Resident	118,688 (14.2%)	\$2,754,540,244 (19.1%)
Non-CA Resident	114,401 (13.7%)	\$2,137,843,307 (14.8%)

Source: DCSS, Integrated Data Base; FTB, all other data.

## Appendix E—Performance Measures Adopted by DCSS

Family Code Section 17602 required DCSS to adopt performance standards effective January 1, 2001, in consultation with local child support agencies and child support advocates. In accordance with that section, the performance standards outlined in Family Code Section 17602 (a) are adopted as the state performance measures for the restructured California child support program. In addition, the federal performance measures outlined in Section 458 (A) of the Social Security Act are also being adopted. The performance standards will be put into regulations effective July 1, 2001.

The performance standards adopted by DCSS are outlined below. The first five are the federal measures and will be reported annually as of September 30<sup>th</sup> of each year. The remaining nine are state measures and will be reported quarterly.

### Federal Measures – Annual Reporting

#### 1. Paternity establishment percentage

The “IV-D Paternity Establishment Percentage” measures the ratio of the total number of children in the IV-D caseload who have been born out-of-wedlock and for whom paternity has been established or acknowledged.

Paternity established or acknowledged includes voluntary acknowledgments (in California, POP declarations) and all types of orders, including court and administrative orders. Paternity can only be counted once, by either an acknowledgment or by an order.

#### 2. Percent of cases with a child support order

This performance standard measures cases with support orders as compared with the total caseload. Support orders are broadly defined as all legally enforceable orders, including orders for health insurance, and zero support orders.

#### 3. Current collections performance

This performance standard measures the amount of current support collected as compared to the total amount owed, expressed as a percentage.

#### 4. Arrearage collections performance

This performance standard measures cases with child support arrearage collections as compared with cases owing arrearages.

Former Assistance cases, if some past-due support was owed to the family at the time of the collection, the case is only counted if some of the collection (regardless

## Appendix E—Performance Measures Adopted by DCSS

of source) was applied to past-due support and paid to the family. If no past due support was owed to the family at the time of the collection, the case is counted if the collection, regardless of source, was retained by the state.

### 5. Cost-effectiveness performance level

This performance standard measures the total amount of distributed collections compared to the total amount of expenditures for the fiscal year.

### State Measures – Quarterly Reporting

#### 1. Percent of cases with a court order for current support.

This performance standard measures the ratio of cases that have an order for current support established. This measure will not include medically needy only cases.

#### 2. Percent of cases with collections for current support

This performance standard measures the ratio of cases in which at least one payment for current support has been collected during the reporting period as compared with cases due current support.

#### 3. Average amount collected per case for all cases with collections

This performance standard measures the collections on a per case basis. This will be a reflection of the average collection for cases receiving some collections in the reporting period.

#### 4. Percent of cases with an order for arrears

This performance standard measures the percentage of the cases within the caseload with arrears due. This measure excludes medically needy only cases.

#### 5. Percent of cases with arrears collections

This performance standard measures the number of cases with child support arrearage collections as compared with cases owing arrearages.

Former Assistance cases, if some past-due support was owed to the family at the time of the collection, the case is counted only if some of the collection regardless of source was applied to past-due support and paid to the family. If no past due support was owed to the family at the time of the collection, the case is counted if the collection, regardless of source, was retained by the state.

## Appendix E—Performance Measures Adopted by DCSS

This measure is identical to federal measure number four above, but will be tracked quarterly by the state.

6. Percent of alleged fathers or obligors who were served with a summons and complaint to establish paternity or a support order during the period.

This performance standard measures the total number of summons and complaints served for cases requiring services to establish paternity and/or a support order.

7. Percent of children for whom paternity has been established during the period

This performance standard measures the ratio of the total number of children in the caseload who have been born out-of-wedlock and for whom paternity has been established or acknowledged in the reporting period.

8. Percent of cases that had a support order established during the period

This performance standard measures the percentage of cases that had an order for support established during the reporting period as compared with the cases needing an order established.

9. Total child support dollars collected per \$1.00 of total expenditure.

This measure compares the total amount of distributed collections to the total amount of expenditures for the fiscal year.

This measure is identical to federal measure number five above, but will be tracked quarterly by the state.

**Appendix F—Remaining County Interim Systems  
Conversions Schedule**

<b>County</b>	<b>Consortia System</b>	<b>Conversion Date</b>
Yolo	KIDZ	February 2001
Yuba	KIDZ	April 2001
Humboldt	CASES	May 2001
Madera	CASES	May 2001
El Dorado	CASES	September 2001
Tehama	CASES	September 2001
Orange	ARS	September 2001
Fresno	STAR/KIDZ	November 2001
San Diego	ARS	February 2002

## **Appendix G—CCSAS Qualified Business Partner Pool**

The CCSAS Project Partner Qualification Team announced the qualification of the following firms to participate as business partners for the Child Support Enforcement component of CCSAS:

- Deloitte Consulting
- Electronic Data Systems (lead partner with CBSI and Natoma Technologies)
- IBM (lead partner with American Management Systems, Inc. (AMS), and Accenture (formerly Andersen Consulting))
- Lockheed-Martin
- TRW Systems & Information Technology Group
- Unisys Corporation (lead partner with MAXIMUS, Informatix, Certified Systems Inc., Endeavor Systems Consultants, and Revenue Solutions Incorporated.)